UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA		
United States of America) A,) Fi)	le No. 20-cr-181 (PJS/BRT)
V .		nneapolis, Minnesc
Branden Michael Wolfe,		ay 4, 2021 00 a.m.
Defendant.)	
	ORABLE PATRICK ES DISTRICT COU (SENTENCING)	
<u>APPEARANCES</u> For the Plaintiff:	U.S. ATTORNE HARRY JACOBS DAVID STEINK 300 S. 4th S Minneapolis,	S, AUSA KAMP, AUSA
For the Defendant:	DOUGLAS OLSO	•
Court Reporter:	DEBRA K. BEA	BEAUVAIS, RPR-CRR
		Minnesota 55415
Proceedings recorded transcript produced by co		stenography;
cramberipe produced by co	mpacer.	

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	IN OPEN COURT
3	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. United States
4	District Court for the District of Minnesota is now in
5	session, the Honorable Patrick J. Schiltz presiding.
6	THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated.
7	We are here this morning for sentencing in the
8	case of United States of America v. Branden Michael Wolfe.
9	The case is Criminal No. 20-0181.
10	If I could have the attorneys make their
11	appearances, please, beginning with the prosecutors.
12	MR. JACOBS: Harry Jacobs on behalf of the United
13	States. Good morning, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Jacobs.
15	MR. STEINKAMP: Good morning, Your Honor. David
16	Steinkamp also on behalf of the United States.
17	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Steinkamp.
18	MR. OLSON: And Doug Olson with the Defender's
19	Office on behalf of Mr. Wolfe, who is present and with me
20	here today.
21	THE COURT: And good morning to both of you.
22	Mr. Wolfe previously pled guilty to conspiracy to
23	commit arson.
24	Mr. Jacobs, has the government received a copy of
25	the PSR and the addendum?

THE COURT: And you have no objections; is that correct? MR. JACOBS: No objections, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Olson, have you and your client received copies of the PSR and the addendum? MR. OLSON: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: And have you read and discussed those documents? MR. OLSON: Yes. THE COURT: And you, too, have no objections; is that correct? MR. OLSON: That's correct. THE COURT: All right. I adopt as the findings of this Court all of the factual statements in the PSR. In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court. THE COURT: How about if I seal them for five	1	MR. JACOBS: We have, Your Honor.
MR. JACOBS: No objections, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Olson, have you and your client received copies of the PSR and the addendum? MR. OLSON: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: And have you read and discussed those documents? MR. OLSON: Yes. THE COURT: And you, too, have no objections; is that correct? MR. OLSON: That's correct. THE COURT: All right. I adopt as the findings of this Court all of the factual statements in the PSR. In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	2	THE COURT: And you have no objections; is that
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Olson, have you and your client received copies of the PSR and the addendum? MR. OLSON: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: And have you read and discussed those documents? MR. OLSON: Yes. THE COURT: And you, too, have no objections; is that correct? MR. OLSON: That's correct. THE COURT: All right. I adopt as the findings of this Court all of the factual statements in the PSR. In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	3	correct?
your client received copies of the PSR and the addendum? MR. OLSON: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: And have you read and discussed those documents? MR. OLSON: Yes. THE COURT: And you, too, have no objections; is that correct? MR. OLSON: That's correct. THE COURT: All right. I adopt as the findings of this Court all of the factual statements in the PSR. In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	4	MR. JACOBS: No objections, Your Honor.
MR. OLSON: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: And have you read and discussed those documents? MR. OLSON: Yes. THE COURT: And you, too, have no objections; is that correct? MR. OLSON: That's correct. THE COURT: All right. I adopt as the findings of this Court all of the factual statements in the PSR. In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	5	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Olson, have you and
THE COURT: And have you read and discussed those documents? MR. OLSON: Yes. THE COURT: And you, too, have no objections; is that correct? MR. OLSON: That's correct. THE COURT: All right. I adopt as the findings of this Court all of the factual statements in the PSR. In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	6	your client received copies of the PSR and the addendum?
documents? MR. OLSON: Yes. THE COURT: And you, too, have no objections; is that correct? MR. OLSON: That's correct. THE COURT: All right. I adopt as the findings of this Court all of the factual statements in the PSR. In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	7	MR. OLSON: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And you, too, have no objections; is that correct? MR. OLSON: That's correct. THE COURT: All right. I adopt as the findings of this Court all of the factual statements in the PSR. In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	8	THE COURT: And have you read and discussed those
that correct? MR. OLSON: That's correct. THE COURT: All right. I adopt as the findings of this Court all of the factual statements in the PSR. In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	9	documents?
that correct? MR. OLSON: That's correct. THE COURT: All right. I adopt as the findings of this Court all of the factual statements in the PSR. In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	10	MR. OLSON: Yes.
13 MR. OLSON: That's correct. 14 THE COURT: All right. I adopt as the findings of this Court all of the factual statements in the PSR. In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	11	THE COURT: And you, too, have no objections; is
THE COURT: All right. I adopt as the findings of this Court all of the factual statements in the PSR. In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	12	that correct?
this Court all of the factual statements in the PSR. In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	13	MR. OLSON: That's correct.
In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	14	THE COURT: All right. I adopt as the findings of
we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	15	this Court all of the factual statements in the PSR.
behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	16	In terms of sealed documents, Mr. Olson, I think
sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	17	we've just got the letters that were submitted by and on
position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	18	behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I didn't see anything particularly
to keep those sealed? MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	19	sensitive in those letters. It's very similar to the
MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	20	position paper that you filed. Is there any reason we have
little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	21	to keep those sealed?
letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.	22	MR. OLSON: I'd ask that they be sealed. I get a
	23	little bit concerned about the press printing a mother's
THE COURT: How about if I seal them for five	24	letter and/or his personal letter to the Court.
	25	THE COURT: How about if I seal them for five

```
1
       years to get them past the time when anybody would be
 2
       interested in them?
 3
                 MR. OLSON: That would be fine, Your Honor.
                 THE COURT: That's what we'll do, then. We'll
 4
 5
       seal those for five years.
                 Next is the issue of restitution, which I want to
 6
 7
       address. I've read the parties' briefs on restitution. Is
 8
       there anything that anybody wants to add to what's in the
 9
       written papers? Mr. Olson, did you want to say anything
10
       more on the issue of restitution? If you want to stay
11
       seated, Mr. Olson, that's fine given the --
12
                 MR. OLSON: Just getting back to being a lawyer
13
       again.
14
                 THE COURT: Well, I'm getting back to being a
15
       judge.
               I get that.
16
                 MR. OLSON: Nothing further than what I submitted.
17
       I mean, the Court made a ruling last week and I understand
18
       that, so I had not addressed the issue so I did set forth my
19
       simple position, which I think is kind of almost
20
       self-sufficient statement in the restitution pleading I
21
       filed on Friday, and I'll rely on that.
22
                 THE COURT: All right. And we did, obviously,
23
       spend a lot of time researching and looking at this issue.
24
       I might be wrong about it, but you've preserved your rights
25
       on it and I'll explain my view.
```

1 MR. OLSON: Which is all I was intending. 2 THE COURT: I understand. 3 Mr. Jacobs, anything you wanted to say on the issue of restitution? 4 5 MR. JACOBS: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Let me just dictate a ruling on 6 7 restitution so that the record in this case is complete. 8 The parties have agreed that the mandatory Victims 9 Restitution Act, 18 U.S.C. Section 3663, applies and that 10 the loss amount to the victim of Mr. Wolfe's crime, which is 11 the City of Minneapolis, is \$12 million. Mr. Wolfe 12 contends, however, that he should be required to pay just 1/1000th of that amount, or \$12,000, in restitution. 13 14 Mr. Wolfe reasons that because his involvement in 15 the destruction of the Third Precinct was limited to pushing 16 a wooden barrel into an existing fire and because he did not 17 start any fires himself, ordering restitution in the amount 18 of \$12,000 would be "fair and proportionate" under the 19 circumstances. In support of his argument, Mr. Wolfe cites 20 Paroline v. United States, 572 U.S. 434, a child-pornography 21 case in which the Supreme Court held that "restitution is... 22 proper under 18 U.S.C. Section 2259 only to the extent the 23 defendant's offense proximately caused a victim's losses." 24 In this case, Mr. Wolfe argues the losses "proximately 25 caused" by his actions were "minimal, as should the losses

attributed to him for restitution purposes."

I do not agree with Mr. Wolfe's argument.

I'm required by 18 U.S.C. Section 3664(f)(1)(A) to "order restitution to each victim in the full amount of each victim's losses as determined by the court and without consideration of the economic circumstances of the defendant." Section 3664(h) provides that courts have discretion to either "make each defendant liable for payment of the full amount of restitution" or "apportion liability among the defendants to reflect the level of contribution to the victim's loss and economic circumstances of each defendant." But a court may not award less than the full amount of the loss caused by the offense of conviction.

Mr. Wolfe argues that under *Paroline*, the Court can disregard the statutory mandate and instead order restitution commensurate with his limited role in the conspiracy. I do not agree with his interpretation of *Paroline*.

Paroline concerned the question of how to order restitution in the case of a defendant convicted of possession of child pornography. The issue was difficult because of what the Supreme Court called the "somewhat atypical causal process underlying the losses" to the victims of child pornography. The defendant in Paroline was one of thousands -- probably tens or hundreds of thousands

-- of people who viewed the images of the victim. Thousands of people viewed those images before the defendant, and thousands would view those images after the defendant, as they would be available on the internet forever.

On the one hand, the fact that many thousands of people had viewed and would continue to view images of the victim's sexual abuse caused her grievous and ongoing harm. On the other hand, the fact that a particular defendant viewed images of the victim's sexual abuse did not cause her any marginal harm. In other words, the amount of harm caused by the victim's knowledge that people were looking at the images would be exactly the same whether the number of viewers was 99,999 or 100,000 or 100,001.

In light of the "atypical causal process" between the crime of possession of child pornography and the harm it causes to victims, the Supreme Court said the following:

"In this special context, where it can be shown both that a defendant possessed a victim's images and that a victim has outstanding losses caused by the continuing traffic in those images but where it is impossible to trace a particular amount of those losses to the individual defendant by recourse to a more traditional inquiry, a court applying 18 U.S.C. Section 2259 should

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

order restitution in an amount that comports with the defendant's relative role in the causal process that underlies the victim's general losses."

For several reasons, I do not agree with Mr. Wolfe that, under *Paroline*, he should not be held liable for more than \$12,000 to the City of Minneapolis.

First, the Supreme Court explicitly confined its holding in Paroline to the "special context" of child-pornography offenses. The harm caused by arson is nothing like the harm caused by possession of child pornography. The damage caused by an arsonist is not ongoing, it does not grow over time as additional arsonists continuously contribute to the total loss suffered by the victim. Rather, the fire is extinguished and a fixed loss amount is calculated. The damage caused when multiple people join together to burn a building is not the type of "atypical causal process" with which Paroline was concerned. Rather, the damage caused when multiple people joined together to burn a building is like the damage caused when multiple people join together to rob a bank or defraud an insurance company. In such cases, the defendants are almost always held jointly and severally liable for the full amount of the victim's losses, even though the victim's losses would have been the same if any one defendant had not

participated in the crime, and even if not all the perpetrators have been identified.

Second, although the PSR suggests that there may have been 1,000 or more people gathered outside of the Third Precinct on the evening of May 28th, 2020, that does not mean that all 1,000 protestors participated in the burning of the Third Precinct. To the contrary, many people in that crowd were urging the mob of which Mr. Wolfe was a part to remain peaceful and not to attack the building. Thus, Mr. Wolfe was not like Doyle Paroline and other possessors of child pornography, one of many thousands of perpetrators causing harm to a single victim.

And, finally, Mr. Wolfe overlooks the fact he has been convicted of *conspiracy* to commit arson. The conspiracy of which Mr. Wolfe was a member included not just him and not just his three indicted co-conspirators; rather, it included all of those -- indicted and unindicted -- who conspired to burn the Third Precinct. As the Ninth Circuit explained in *United States v. Grovo*, 826 F.3d 1207,

"Paroline did not abrogate the longstanding rule that a defendant convicted of a conspiracy is liable for restitution for not only those harms resulting from the defendant's individual actions, but also others caused by the conspiracy itself.

Indeed, Paroline expressly distinguished cases 1 2 in which wrongdoers act in concert with each 3 other, and derived its proximate causation rule from a statutory provision requiring 4 5 restitution for any losses suffered by the victim as a proximate result of the offense. 6 7 When the offense is conspiracy, Paroline 8 requires restitution for any losses 9 proximately caused by the conspiracy -- not 10 those caused by the individual defendant." 11 For these reasons, I'm not persuaded by 12 Mr. Wolfe's argument that he should be required to pay only 13 \$12,000 in restitution to the City of Minneapolis. Instead, 14 I will order him to pay the full amount of the City's loss. 15 I've already ordered that Dylan Robinson be held jointly and 16 severally liable for that amount, and I will likely order 17 that Mr. Wolfe's other co-defendants be held jointly and 18 severally liable as well. Of course, I recognize that, 19 unless Mr. Wolfe wins the lottery, he will end up paying 20 only a tiny fraction of that loss. 21 All right. Mr. Jacobs, do you want to move for 22 the additional one-level reduction for acceptance? 23 MR. JACOBS: We do, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: That motion is granted, and I 25 determine the guidelines apply as follows: The total

```
1
       offense level is 21. The criminal-history category is II
 2
       with three points. The imprisonment range recommended is
 3
       between 41 months and 51 months in prison. The supervised
       release range recommended is 1 to 3 years. The fine range
 4
 5
       15,000 to $150,000. And the special assessment $100.
 6
                 Mr. Jacobs, does that sound correct to you?
 7
                 MR. JACOBS: It does, Your Honor.
                 THE COURT: And Mr. Olson?
 8
 9
                 MR. OLSON: Yes, Your Honor.
10
                 THE COURT: My understanding is that neither side
11
       is moving for a departure under the guidelines. I do
12
       understand that the defendant is seeking a variance under
13
       3553(a). Is that correct on the government's side,
14
       Mr. Jacobs?
15
                 MR. JACOBS: Yes, Your Honor.
16
                 THE COURT: And, Mr. Olson, on your side?
17
                 MR. OLSON: That's correct.
18
                 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Olson, let me then invite
19
       you to say whatever you would like on behalf of Mr. Wolfe.
20
       If you want to come to the podium for this, that's fine with
21
       me.
22
                 MR. OLSON: Does my mask stay on?
23
                 THE COURT: Are you fully vaccinated?
24
                 MR. OLSON:
                            Yes.
25
                 THE COURT:
                             Then you can take your mask off.
```

MR. OLSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: Not a question that I had asked people

for the first 15 years of my career, but --

MR. OLSON: Not a question I ever asked a judge, if I could take my mask off. Good to see everybody. Good to be back.

As to Mr. Wolfe, you know, I'm not going to give a big speech here. I've submitted a position paper outlining a lot of the circumstances surrounding Mr. Wolfe -- his background, his involvement in this offense, and what my recommendation was for sentencing. But I'm not going to spend a lot of time just rehashing that. The Court knows my position. I may alter that a little bit as we go forward here.

But what I do want to say about Mr. Wolfe and what I want the Court -- and I think the Court can sincerely understand this -- is that he certainly has had his difficulties, and he sincerely suffers from a form of mental illness -- bipolar disorder, which we used to call manic depressive.

And, you know, when I first saw him as a client, and which was only a few days after he was arrested and he'd become in the federal custody, I mean, I'm talking about somebody that was in a full manic phase. And you could kind of see the thought process, the scatter-brainedness of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

difficulty he had focusing on things and how it was driving his thinking and how it had driven his behaviors in the past. And I'll get back to that in a little bit, but if you look at what -- his form of mental illness, which goes back -- it may go back to a brain injury at his birth, but he's had troubles throughout his childhood and all of his life in the form of some forms of mental illness, which have made him different. He's felt different, and he has been different, and it's affected his behaviors particularly -if you look at these couple of years, he quits -- he quits high school. He quits home-schooling; I'll just leave that alone. And he starts wandering around the country basically following one and then another girlfriend around in what now I can recognize, and I think he recognizes, in a bit of manic disorder and just complete and utter chaos without really a goal or a purpose in life, other than kind of following the next thing -- the next energy that presents itself, the next circumstance, ultimately leading into a bizarre trail that just lands him in Minnesota by happenstance one day. And here he's been for the last few years dealing with homelessness. His life is characterized by homelessness and living in shelters. And that was the life that he had -- that's the life that he was dealing with.

And I think that you don't have to be well-versed

in psychiatry to see you have somebody who has some pretty significant mental-health issues going on in his life, inability to kind of focus and control and do what other people would view as more normalized behaviors.

But going forward, in the aftermath of his -- and I'll talk about the offense a little bit later on, but that's not really my focus here. In the aftermath of him getting arrested and me talking with him and getting to know him as a person, you know, he knew that he was troubled. I mean, he has had enough interaction with mental-health problems, and growing up particularly, that he knew that he needed help and direction. I mean, he had previously been committed, I think, for a short term about a year previously at the University of Minnesota. So he knew he had problems.

He reached out to the jail staff about his racing mind, his problems, and his mental-health issues. He couldn't sleep, and he couldn't focus. I give the jail a lot of credit. And I'm not a guy that gives the jail a lot of credit, because I've had nothing but problems with jail for most of my career, particularly dealing with undiagnosed mental-health issues, because they usually just -- well, that's just part of the problem. But they helped him, and they helped him quite a bit. They put him on medication.

And I could see the results within a week or two about how it had changed him and affected him. And he

started working on his own self-help with the medication trying to get a regular -- just a regular -- things that we take for granted -- sleeping a regular night's sleep, getting up in the morning, exercising, eating regularly. All of these things were significant life-changing events for him given his previous history. And he started kind of putting his mind back into some kind of framework of order and including dealing with this offense.

You know, when he was interviewed, you know, he was interviewed right away by the St. Paul police and the ATF; quite an engaging young man. And he was more than willing to talk. He was quite honest and open about everything. They asked him about it. They showed him his picture at the bureau, and he said, well, I picked that up and put it there. That's the arson here. They came back and talked with him; very polite, you know. And I'm quite sure that if you asked the ATF people they would acknowledge the same — the manic, scatter-brained, flow of consciousness thinking that we were dealing with here.

But as things progressed, you know, he got better with the medication, he started focusing in. And then we got him released to the halfway house, he finally got to go see -- a formal counselor got involved and he got to see a psychiatrist. The psychiatrist then changed and put him on the appropriate anti-psychotic bipolar medications. He

started in on therapy. And that has been a godsend to him, and it's changed him. It's changed and altered the course of his life.

And most recently, the last couple months, he's been doing chemical dependency treatment as well, all of which has been positive and helpful for him.

So the person that the Court sees here is very much different than the person that was standing on that building out there with his boom box, waving his hand, jumped down from a concrete flag poll and pushed a barrel towards the fire.

He's remorseful. He is embarrassed about what he did. He's ashamed of himself. The Court said, yeah, there were a thousand people there but not everybody -- he knows he was on the wrong side of all of that. It was wrong behavior. He recognizes it. He's sorry for what he did. And the things he said both in his letter to the Court and his acceptance of responsibility are sincere and heartfelt.

I was just talking with him. I've spent an enormous amount of time with him in part because he needed it, in part because I think that it was good for him. And I wanted to make sure that I could figure out what was going on with him and share his story accurately. But he's thankful that he got the help that he needs. It's too bad that it took this to get there. So he is very thankful

about the opportunities he has had.

He's ashamed and sorry for what he did. And he views his future differently because he can see some purpose, he can see some hope, and he sees some long-term optimism coming out of all this given that he is in a much better mental state in terms of dealing with the world and dealing with the chaos in his mind.

Now, everything hasn't been all smooth and dandy with him. I mean, he's had nothing but rules violations at the halfway house. We'll get to that later. But life isn't particularly simple or easy for him on a lot of levels. But the point of all this is that he's doing much better, he's in a much better position now that he's being treated for his bipolar disorder in therapy and learning how to do that.

And he recognizes that this is a lifetime struggle he is going to have. Life isn't going to be easy for him. He's going to have to take medication the rest of his life. He knows that. He is going to have to engage himself in therapy and counseling maybe the rest of his life, but it's going to be an ongoing thing. He is only less than a year into dealing with all this. This takes years to get there. But he is working on it hard. And he really does mean well, and he's sincere in the things that he says. And when he says that he is thankful for the intervention in his life, he means it. And it's not just something that he's throwing

out there to try and get a better sentence.

Now, as to sentencing -- and I've set forth my position about a probationary sentence and not sending him and people like him to prison, but I'm not going to harp on that. I think the Court can decide what it needs to do here. And I would suggest, though, that maybe the Court can move the guideline numbers down a bit. I suggest that there's nothing to be served in this case by a sentence that was -- 24 months would do everything that a sentence 42 months would serve, which is what the government is asking if the Court is rejecting my position on a probationary-type sentence.

I think that there is some question of proportionality in terms of what he actually did here in pushing of the barrel, his lack of preplanning, and lack of actually starting the fire, and all these kinds of things
I've kind of laid out there. But that's not really what I stood up here to talk about.

I just wanted to say on his behalf that whatever happens here, he's never whined about it. He's been responsible from day one. The ATF agents were happy. They went and talked with him. They came back and they talked with him several times. They were happy with him. The government was happy. He worked out a deal right away, I think the first of all the people that might have pled

1 later, but we worked out a deal right away. He was very 2 cooperative with everybody. He has not ever dodged his own 3 responsibility for what he did that night and his 4 participation in that whole affair was wrong. He knows it, 5 and he has owned up to it. 6 I think that going forward here he will be able to 7 eventually adjust to a normal life. He will take his 8 medication. He will engage in counseling. He will continue 9 to work on the things that he needs to. Like I said, he's 10 only nine months into that lifetime journey, but he's in a 11 much, much better position and state of mind here today than 12 he was when he committed this offense nearly a year ago. So I'd ask the Court to take all that into 13 14 consideration, treat him with some compassion, think about 15 those things. And if the Court rejects my probationary 16 request, consider whittling down the government's 42-month 17 request a bit on his behalf. 18 Thank you. 19 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Olson. 20 Mr. Wolfe, did you want to say anything this 21 morning? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, the only thing I can 23 really say is that my letter doesn't really reflect -- words 24 -- the downside of words is that they never on paper can 25 reflect what the heart and mind truly feel.

And just yesterday I actually was speaking to my treatment counselor about how in the beginning I deflected accountability for my actions citing that I was intoxicated and, you know, it was a split-second decision. And I realized that even though I was saying, okay, yes, I made that choice, I was still deflecting the accountability. And, you know, I just realized that yesterday, after nine or ten months after the event. But with that, I'm excited and I'm looking forward to the ability to actually start working on that process of learning to truly take accountability for my actions.

You know, I respect any decision that this Court makes. And I just -- I really look forward to whether term of imprisonment -- when I get out, and during that time just focusing on really bettering myself so I can be a better person for society and just for myself in general.

I do have a three-year-old daughter, and I accept the fact that due to my actions, I will probably never have a close bond with her until she's an adult. And I don't want to be 18 years from now her seeing me as a man that never did anything with himself, that never got himself together, that just kept following the same path that he has been that caused me to lose the opportunity to raise her. And that is my biggest motivation to really better myself as a person so that I can say, Hey, Alana, I made really bad

1	choices, I went down a really bad path, and I neglected a
2	lot of things, including you. But since then I've learned
3	how to take accountability and to really work on being
4	better and making a better life for myself. And that is
5	really all that I can say, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Wolfe.
7	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.
8	THE COURT: Mr. Jacobs, I understand you have a
9	couple people here that would like to address the Court as
10	well. They can do it before you or after you, however they
11	want to do this.
12	MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, I will let them speak
13	before me if that's
14	THE COURT: All right.
15	Good morning. If I could have you just state your
16	initials so we can identify you on the record in that way,
17	and I'd be happy to hear anything you have to say.
18	VICTIM WITNESS CN: CN.
19	THE COURT: All right.
20	VICTIM WITNESS CN: And I have been fully
21	vaccinated so can I remove the mask?
22	THE COURT: Yes.
23	VICTIM WITNESS CN: Thank you.
24	Honorable Judge Schiltz, for the past 25 years I
25	have worked as a civilian employee for the Minneapolis

Police Department. I have had the privilege of being assigned to the Third Precinct for over half of those years.

The entire neighborhood that is served by the Third Precinct is affectionately called the south side of Minneapolis. The Third Precinct was not just a public service building but an integral part of our community.

It's difficult to use past tense words like was, as it implies that the building is dead and I know metaphorically it is. Like a young adult dying too soon, the building was only about 35 years old. It is now a ravaged corpse. So, too, like a deceased family member, stories of what used to be are slowly being shared by community members and employees like myself.

Each May the precinct hosted an annual open house for school children to have a fun free lunch with McGruff.

Our mounted units stopped by and inner city kids who've never petted a horse would like up for that. Youth would then clutch their tickets to see who would win a free bike that officers had secured for them.

There was a small community room in the front of the building where many a court-ordered visitation between parents and vulnerable children would safely meet.

The larger community room hosted many supportive retirement parties with community members and MPD employees at the end of their careers, some careers cut short due to

illness or cancer.

A little, free library greeted everyone at the precinct's front door.

This was not just a building but an integral part of our south side community. I say "our" for I live less than two miles from the precinct. I drive by the old precinct routinely as a south-sider.

I will never forget the night of mayhem, carnage, and destruction as I watched in horror fixated on a live feed online media program. There I saw in full view jackals, dingoes, and street dogs desecrating the precinct and trying to burn it to the ground. I shook and screamed in my house, sobbing uncontrollably as my beloved precinct was attacked. I use the words "jackals, dingoes and street dogs" as I didn't recognize anyone being in human form as they ran in and out of the building.

It has been a personal challenge to live with the aftermath of the destruction of the Third Precinct. I couldn't leave my house for two weeks last summer after this incident and had a neighbor bring me groceries. I stay up half the night with the lights on fearing that I would somehow be attacked. The image of the burning building still blazes in my mind's eye. All summer long I forced myself to go to the farmer's market held nearby in an open lot by the former precinct. Often I would just stand aside

1 weeping from the mindless destruction that took place. 2 I cannot fathom what kind of deranged minds could 3 conduct themselves in such a manner to blow up a public 4 service building. I hope the Sentencing Guidelines are 5 implemented by the Court. 6 From time to time I see some of my co-workers who 7 worked that night in threes. They look shell-shocked, like soldiers from war movies. I see and can hear how their 8 9 disassociation impacts their lives, once vibrant people now 10 looking like zombies with pain seared on their faces as they try to walk forward. 11 12 I'm grateful there wasn't any physical loss of 13 life of any of the MPD officers or civilians that night; 14 however, it's too soon to say what the long-term affects 15 will be on any of us who lived through that carnage. 16 Emotionally and psychologically it takes longer to heal from 17 attacks against our personhood than broken bones. 18 I trust that law and order will prevail. I pray 19 that justice is served. It will be a start, like a balm, 20 that helps those of us who live with the aftermath of the 21 destruction of the Third Precinct. 22 Thank you. 23 THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you. 24 Good morning, Ma'am. If you could just give us 25 your initials as well, please.

1 VICTIM WITNESS KL: Good morning. My initials are 2 KL. 3 THE COURT: All right. What would you like to say this morning? 4 5 VICTIM WITNESS KL: Thank you. So often police 6 officers are not heard. I've been a police officer in the 7 State of Minnesota for 37 years, and this event pushed me to retire. 8 9 I've never cared if anybody respected me as a 10 That was never why I was wearing the uniform. 11 wore the uniform because it was a symbol and it was a symbol 12 that people needed to respect. 13 The building that we lost that day, my office was 14 on the second floor of that building. I went in the next 15 day and it was totally destroyed. My office was melted. 16 Everything I had in that office was gone. I took out when I 17 left what I could of personal belongings. But I'm not 18 telling you this because of things that I personally lost --19 possessions -- but what the community lost and what we, as 20 police officers, lost. We lost something that was just 21 referred to as bricks and mortar, but it was more. It was 22 more to the community, and it was more to the officers that 23 worked there. That was home. That was my home. 24 The summer before that, at the open house, I took 25 my 84-year-old father through the precinct on a tour, and he

smiled at everybody that I introduced him to and told everybody how proud he was that his daughter was there as a police officer protecting Minnesota and Minneapolis.

It's been difficult in the months since this happened. The days to follow I was in uniform every day.

Most days a short day would be 20 hours. We had to stand up and protect the Fifth Precinct following the loss of our home. And we had a lot of help, which was nice, because it meant a lot to us as street officers to be able to stand there side by side with state patrol, with our federal partners.

And it meant the world to me to find out that somebody cared enough about our building and our home that they would investigate this crime, because this crime wasn't just against the City of Minneapolis, it was against every officer that called that home. It was against everybody in the community around there.

message to the world that it was okay to desecrate that type of a building that meant and was a symbol of not only our flag but everything that we call just in our democracy. And I think that that was a symbol that went out, and it's been tried all over now -- in Seattle, Portland, we're hearing all over. That was the start of the civil unrest. And I think by sentencing the way that you have been and the way

1 that I'm hoping you will it sends a message that it's not 2 right. 3 I appreciate that Mr. Wolfe is getting the help he He's the same age as my children. But what nobody 4 5 really cared about is that I am a mom. I'm a grandma. 6 a wife. I'm a sister. I'm a daughter. And our building, 7 our home was taken from us. 8 I stood on the lines with officers in my gas mask 9 with my riot gear on. I had ice bottles pelted at me, 10 rocks. And I understand -- along with the over 200 officers 11 that also left our department -- we understand that we were 12 not supported the way we should've been. And this does send 13 a message. And I will be letting other officers know that 14 there is somebody that cares enough -- and the ATF, the 15 FBI and in the court systems -- about us and about what we 16 went through. 17 There's many of us that will probably never be the 18 We've been damaged. And we probably will always feel same. 19 like damaged goods. I hope to get my power back. And I 20 believe this is a step in that direction. And I want to 21 thank you for that, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Thanks for 23 coming in this morning. 24 Mr. Jacobs. 25 MR. JACOBS: If I may, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes. You are fully vaccinated?

MR. JACOBS: I am, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. JACOBS: Your Honor is very well aware of the context and the backdrop that this case transpired against, and I won't reiterate or dwell on it, but I will start by saying that the fact that the arsons in this case played out against a backdrop of protests in Minneapolis is certainly important. That the arson in this case was at the Third Precinct of the Minneapolis Police Department is certainly important. This is a backdrop against which this offense took place. It provides context. But it's certainly not an excuse for What happened, and it's certainly not an excuse for Mr. Wolfe's conduct.

Your Honor, I'll start by providing a little bit of context to some of the things that Mr. Olson said, providing the government's point of view on a few of his points. The first is to agree with Mr. Olson that to some extent Mr. Wolfe's culpability is diminished by the difficulties he's faced in his child, by his substance-abuse issues, by his mental-health issues. By all accounts he had a challenging childhood. It seems many times Mr. Wolfe was forced to be the adult in the room and that was a situation for which he was ill-equipped. His substance-abuse issues and his mental-health challenges were certainly exacerbated

by that. Again, this is not an excuse or justification for his actions, but it provides context for them.

The second point is to confirm something that Mr. Olson said, which is that after Mr. Wolfe was arrested he did meet with the government. He met with the government multiple times. He met with the St. Paul Police Department. He met with ATF. He met with FBI. And he did immediately accept responsibility. He was open and honest in meeting with the government. He did not minimize his conduct. And that is separate and apart from an argument about his role in the conduct, but he did not minimize the actual conduct. I believe, in my estimation, that he was truthful and he was honest. And he did immediately accept responsibility, and to the government that means something and that counts for something.

Finally the last point, Your Honor, is about Mr. Wolfe's criminal history. To an extent Mr. Wolfe's criminal history is concerning. This is his first felony offense, but he does have some significant previous convictions for domestic-abuse issues. That's different than what we're standing up here talking about today -- an arson at the Third Precinct -- but I think it's worth mentioning. I think it's important to take that into consideration as we think of this.

But, Your Honor, I also want to share a little bit

more context: the context of officers who were stationed in the Third Precinct, the context of individuals who lived in that area, context of residents of Minneapolis in general who watched this play out back in May of 2020.

Your Honor, you just heard from a few individuals who shared the impact of this crime. You've also read many of the victim impact statements that other police officers and community members and others have submitted to the Court. And to those accounts I would only add that the destruction of an active police precinct in the City of Minneapolis was nearly unfathomable a year ago, but it did happen, Your Honor.

I can provide some of my own context about the destruction of the Third Precinct. I walked through the precinct. I firsthand saw the damage. I can attest to melted furniture, to destruction, to vandalism, to spray paint, to 45 different areas of origin -- 45 separate fires set in and around that building. And it was abundantly clear walking through the Third Precinct that the rage and the anger was directly thrust upon that building -- that building as a symbol and that building as a structure. And that in no way excuses the conduct of Mr. Wolfe or his co-conspirators, but it does create an important juxtaposition between the destruction and the damage to the

offices, liquor stores, pawn shops throughout the Twin Cities.

In contrast, Your Honor, to the vast destruction that we saw unfold in the Twin Cities, you have the specific actions that Mr. Wolfe took that night. And I think it's important to note that Mr. Wolfe's specific conduct did play a seemingly small role in the overall destruction. He pushed a barrel into a fire outside the precinct. That fire was already burning. He knew it would engulf the fire and make the fire bigger, it would accelerate the fire.

In the government's estimation, he had a below-average involvement compared to his co-conspirators --both indicted and unindicted. And to an extent the government understands his arguments that he played a small role in the destruction of the Third Precinct. But, Your Honor, as I said before, there is no small role when it comes to the destruction of an active police precinct.

There's no small role when it comes to someone lighting or accelerating or making bigger a fire at the entrance to a building with an unknown number of people inside that building.

To that argument I also respond that there's no small role when it comes to the negative effect and the damage to the movement that Mr. Wolfe and others were purporting to be supporting when they were down there, the

detrimental effect caused by the actions of a very small number of people who went from peaceful protest and crossed the threshold to damage, violence, destruction, and arson.

I'd also note that Mr. Wolfe following the incident with the barrel went into the building, went in, took multiple pieces of police equipment that he was actually wearing at the time he was arrested.

And finally, Your Honor, I would note that

Mr. Wolfe pled guilty to conspiracy to commit arson and with
that he takes responsibility for the actions of his
co-conspirators. And Mr. Wolfe may rightly view it unfair
or lack of proportionality to say that he's being held
responsible for actions of multiple people who set 45 fires
throughout the precinct. And to that, Your Honor, we
respond that that's precisely why a significant sentence is
required here, to send a message that the conduct here is
unacceptable and that doing so will incur substantial
penalty.

And, Your Honor, I'd end with one final point, which is that the government was thoughtful in its charging decision as to Mr. Wolfe charging a 371 conspiracy. For many of the reasons I've reiterated today and Mr. Olson reiterated today, that we both include in our sentencing positions -- about Mr. Wolfe's background, about the culpability of many versus the culpability of some -- that

decision to charge a 371 conspiracy took those things into account. And for that reason, Your Honor, we'd request that the Court impose a sentence of 42 months' imprisonment.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Jacobs.

I have carefully reviewed the Presentence

Investigation Report and the addendum to the report. I have
also read the many victim-impact statements that were
incorporated into the report, as well as the letters
submitted by and on behalf of Mr. Wolfe. I now accept the
plea agreement, and I am prepared to impose the sentence.

It is the judgment of the Court that you, Branden Michael Wolfe, are sentenced to prison for a term of 41 months to be served consecutively to any sentence you receive in connection with the criminal charges that are now pending against you in Hennepin County District Court, Case No. 27-cr-20-13156.

No fine is imposed.

You are ordered to pay restitution in the total amount of \$12 million. You are jointly and severally liable for this amount with Dylan Shakespeare Robinson, and your other co-defendants -- Davon De-Andre Turner and Bryce Michael Williams -- will likely be held jointly and severally liable for this amount as well. This amount is due and payable immediately. The interest requirement is waived.

While you are incarcerated, you must make payments toward your restitution obligation as follows: If you are working UNICOR, you must make monthly payments of 50 percent of your earnings. If you are not working UNICOR, you must make quarterly payments of \$25.

After you are released from prison, you must begin making payments toward any remaining restitution obligation within 30 days of your release. You must make monthly payments of at least \$100. If the probation officer determines that you are able to pay more than \$100 per month, then you must make restitution payments in the amount directed by the probation officer.

Your payments should be made to the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, who will forward your payments to the City of Minneapolis.

Your obligation to pay the full amount of restitution continues even after your term of supervised release ends. If you are not able to pay the full amount of restitution at the time your supervised release ends, you may work with the United States Attorney's Office Financial Litigation Unit to arrange a restitution payment plan.

You must pay a special assessment in the amount of \$100 to the United States, due immediately.

On being released from prison, you will be placed on supervised release for a term of two years. While you

are on supervised release, you must comply with the following conditions:

First, you must comply with the mandatory and standard conditions of supervised release described in Section 5D1.3 of the version of the United States Sentencing Guidelines that took effect on November 1st, 2018.

Second, you must participate in a program for substance abuse as directed by the probation officer. The program may include testing and inpatient or outpatient treatment, counseling or a support group. You must contribute to the costs of such treatment as determined by the Probation Office Co-Payment Program.

Third, you must not use alcohol or other intoxicants, whether legal or illegal, and you must not enter bars, liquor stores or other establishments whose primary business is the sale of alcoholic beverages.

Fourth, you must participate in a psychological or psychiatric counseling or treatment program as directed by the probation officer. You must contribute to the costs of such treatment as determined by the Probation Office

Co-Payment Program.

Fifth, you must participate in educational programming, as directed by the probation officer, to obtain a high school diploma or a general equivalency diploma.

Sixth, you must promptly notify the probation

1 officer of any material change in your financial 2 circumstances that might affect your ability to pay 3 restitution. And, finally, seventh, if you do not maintain 4 5 full-time, lawful employment as deemed appropriate by the 6 probation officer, you may be required to do 7 community-service work for up to 20 hours per week until you 8 become employed. You may also be required to participate in 9 training, counseling or daily job searching as directed by 10 the probation officer. 11 I direct that the Probation Office furnish to you 12 a written statement of all the conditions of your supervised 13 release. 14 As you requested, I will recommend that you be 15 designated to a facility in or near Minnesota. 16 Mr. Olson, do you think I should also add an RDAP 17 recommendation? 18 MR. OLSON: Yes, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: All right. I will also add that you 20 be allowed to participate in the RDAP program. 21 In determining what sentence to impose, I have 22 treated the range recommended by the United States 23 Sentencing Guidelines as the starting point and the initial 24 benchmark as Gall v. United States requires. I have not, 25 however, presumed that the Guidelines range is reasonable.

I have instead carefully considered all of the factors described in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a), including the need for the sentence to be sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in Section 3553(a)(2).

As to the sentence of imprisonment, I've sentenced Mr. Wolfe to 41 months in prison, which is the bottom of the range recommended by the United States Sentencing Guidelines.

On the evening of May 28th of 2020 -- an evening on which many thousands of people across the country were protesting the murder of George Floyd while also heeding the pleas of the Floyd family to remain peaceful -- Mr. Wolfe decided to protest police brutality by committing a crime (really, by committing a series of crimes). Specifically, Mr. Wolfe decided to join a mob that attacked, looted, and destroyed the Third Precinct headquarters.

At the time that Mr. Wolfe was feeding a fire near the entrance to the Third Precinct, he had no idea how many people were in that building, where they were located, whether they were impaired or unimpaired or conscious or unconscious or whether they might be trapped and burned alive by the fire that he was feeding.

Nor does it appear that Mr. Wolfe gave a moment's thought to the extraordinary harm he was helping to inflict

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on the people who worked in that building. The Third Precinct was home not just to the four former police officers charged with crimes in connection with the murder of George Floyd, but to many people who had absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with that murder. The Third Precinct was home to dozens of good police officers -police officers who came to work every day and risked their lives to keep their fellow citizens safe. The Third Precinct was also home to many City employees who were not police officers or even involved in law enforcement. actions of Mr. Wolfe and the mob that he joined took away what was for many of these people a second home -- one of the few places where they could feel safe, and a place where they could gather with each other and members of the surrounding community.

Mr. Wolfe also appears to have given no thought to how his actions would affect the people served and protected by the Third Precinct. The Third Precinct is an area where many good, hard working, law-abiding people live, work, start businesses, and raise families. Many of those who live in the Third Precinct immigrated to the United States in order to flee violence and lawlessness in their home countries. The actions of Mr. Wolfe and his co-conspirators terrorized these people; to this day, they feel unsafe in their own homes and neighborhoods. Crime has increased

dramatically in the Third Precinct, and its residents have borne the brunt of that crime. I recognize that crimes increase for many reasons, but the fact that there are fewer police officers and the fact that the remaining police officers are stationed far away from the Third Precinct — both of which are the direct result of the destruction of the Third Precinct headquarters — certainly does not help.

Mr. Wolfe's actions in helping to burn the Third

Precinct are extremely serious in themselves. But he did

not just help to burn the Third Precinct; he also helped to

loot it. Mr. Wolfe went into the building at least twice to

steal police property for himself, including a police vest,

duty belt, set of handcuffs, ear piece, baton, knife, riot

helmet, pistol magazine, police radio, police overdose kit,

uniform name plates, and ammunition. Until he was arrested,

Mr. Wolfe showed zero shame or remorse about his role in

burning and looting the Third Precinct. To the contrary, he

posted on social media about stealing items from the

building, and, when he was arrested almost a week after the

Third Precinct was destroyed, he was wearing the stolen

police vest (on which he'd affixed his own name) and stolen

duty belt, and he was carrying the stolen tactical baton.

And, finally, although Mr. Wolfe has just two misdemeanor convictions, he has twice been charged with felony battery and once with felony kidnapping in connection

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with alleged assaults on his pregnant girlfriend. Those cases were not prosecuted because, as so often happens in domestic-violence cases, the alleged victim later refused to cooperate with the prosecution. I'm not assuming that the allegations against Mr. Wolfe are true, but the fact that he was charged is troubling, especially given that his two misdemeanor convictions also arise out of conflicts with the same girlfriend.

Mr. Wolfe argues that, despite the seriousness of his crime and the extraordinary harm that he helped to cause, he should be put on probation. But Mr. Wolfe is already on probation; in fact, he was on probation at the time that he helped burn down and loot the Third Precinct. Moreover, after being indicted in this case, Mr. Wolfe was placed on pretrial supervision. Needless to say, Mr. Wolfe should have been on his very best behavior. He was not. Instead, Mr. Wolfe committed more than 20 major and minor violations of the rules of the halfway house at which he was living. Even after being hailed before Magistrate Judge Menendez and being explicitly warned both by her and his probation officer that he has to follow the conditions of his presentence release, which includes obeying the rules of the halfway house, Mr. Wolfe has continued to violate the rules of the halfway house as recently as yesterday. A term of probation would not reflect the seriousness of

Mr. Wolfe's offense, promote respect for the law or deter others from committing similar crimes in the future. But I also have little confidence that Mr. Wolfe would follow the conditions of his probation.

Given the severity of Mr. Wolfe's crime and the need to deter similar crimes in the future, I considered giving Mr. Wolfe a 60-month sentence, which would have been the statutory maximum because of the decision of the government to charge Mr. Wolfe only with conspiracy rather than with arson. I decided not to impose a longer sentence for several reasons:

First, although Mr. Wolfe was involved in an awful crime, he played a very small role in that crime. As far as the record reflects, his participation in the burning of the Third Precinct was limited to pushing a wooden barrel into an already existing fire at a time when the building was already burning. Mr. Wolfe did not himself start or try to start any fire.

Second, Mr. Wolfe suffers from significant mental illness and chemical dependency. He had a difficult childhood. He was home-schooled after the fifth grade and kicked out of his home at age 18. He then became a homeless drifter. He used marijuana on a daily basis and frequently abused alcohol. After he was arrested in this case, he was diagnosed with bipolar disorder. He says that, on the

evening that he helped to burn and loot the Third Precinct, he was impaired by drugs and alcohol and experiencing a manic episode. Since his arrest, despite his other problems, Mr. Wolfe has remained sober, he has taken his medications, and he has been very invested in his therapy sessions.

And finally, Mr. Wolfe is a very young man who has never spent more than a few days in jail. A term of 41 months in prison is by far the longest sentence that Mr. Wolfe has ever received from any court. I hope that this sentence will serve as a wake-up call and that, helped by the treatment and medication that he will continue to receive, Mr. Wolfe will be able to turn his life around.

For all these reasons, I find that a sentence of 41 months is sufficient but not greater than necessary to accomplish the goals of Section 3553(a).

As to the term of supervised release, I have imposed a two-year term of supervised release along with conditions to help ensure that Mr. Wolfe continues to get help for his mental illness and chemical dependency, and to make sure that he makes progress in paying restitution.

And finally, I have not imposed a fine because

Mr. Wolfe cannot afford to pay a fine and because I want him
to devote any available funds to paying restitution.

All right. Mr. Wolfe, you have the right to

appeal your conviction if you believe that your guilty plea was unlawful or invalid for any reason.

Usually defendants have the right to appeal their sentence, but you entered into a plea agreement with the government, and in that plea agreement you gave up your right to appeal a sentence of the length I've just imposed. Courts usually enforce those agreements, but, if you think that, notwithstanding your plea agreement, you still have the right to appeal your sentence, you can go ahead and appeal your sentence and you can make your argument to the court of appeals.

If you do want to appeal your conviction or your sentence or both, you have to file a notice of appeal, and you have to do so within 14 days after I enter the judgment in your case, which will be later today. You can ask Mr. Olson to file an appeal for you or you can ask the Clerk of Court to file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

If you cannot afford to pay the costs of an appeal, you can ask for permission to be excused from paying those costs.

The Presentence Investigation Report will be kept in the Court's files under seal. If an appeal is filed, that report will be delivered to the Court of Appeals.

All right. The last thing to address is release status. So, Mr. Olson, let me talk to you about this. I'm

concerned about letting Mr. Wolfe remain free. I'm concerned because he does not have deep ties to this area. He has no family here. He has a girlfriend here, and I think that's the extent of his ties.

I'm also concerned about the just endless series of violations of the rules, including yesterday. I mean, it says a lot to me when someone the day before he shows up for sentencing is still violating the rules of the halfway house despite being warned by a federal magistrate judge about what the likely consequences of that would be. So I have to tell you I'm nervous about the idea of letting him remain free.

MR. OLSON: Your Honor, I'd ask that the Court give him a benefit of a brief period and then voluntarily surrender to the Marshal's Office. There's a couple -- there are some practicalities involved here, including the simple process of cleaning out his place at the halfway house, which would be of assistance to them, as well as the detrimental effect the lack of voluntary surrender has for his security classification, which will impact actually the entire 42-month sentence -- 41-month sentence that he has to do.

You know, his -- I talked to him about this stuff and I'll just say that he really is trying, but he doesn't succeed and he does stuff that he shouldn't, and he doesn't

do things necessarily as responsible as the rest of us. 1 2 don't think he'd want me to use his mental illness as an 3 excuse, but he really does mean well and he is trying. So if the Court would give him a brief period to 4 5 finish up at the halfway house and report to the Marshal's 6 Office, he'd really appreciate it. 7 THE COURT: Does he get credit for self-surrender 8 even if it's just a 24-hour period or something like that? 9 MR. OLSON: Yeah, I have had judges order people 10 to self-surrender to the marshals after court and then you 11 get self-surrender. The period doesn't matter. But if 12 you're in custody, it's a significant hit on you in terms of 13 your security classification. 14 So even 24 hours voluntary surrender does him a 15 world of good. And it really does impact both your 16 placement and then how -- which then impacts the quality of 17 what you do while you're incarcerated. So even having him 18 report this afternoon would be fine, but that alone is a big 19 thing. 20 You know, the rules violation, it's irritating to 21 everybody. It's irritating to me. I mean, I understand 22 that. It's not like he's an entire scofflaw. He just has a 23 hard time sometimes getting up out of bed and doing things 24 like the rest of the world. It's hard sometimes. 25 THE COURT: I mean, these poor people who work at

```
1
       these halfway houses are in the middle of the pandemic going
 2
       to work everyday and working with guys who -- I mean,
 3
       they're doing it so these guys have some place other than
       jail.
 4
 5
                 MR. OLSON: I'm with you.
 6
                 THE COURT: They get thanked for it by disrespect,
 7
       by insults, by refusals to obey just simple commands. You
 8
       know, I have a responsibility to those people as well.
 9
                 MR. OLSON: Yeah, well, I'm with you. So I'm not
10
       asking that it be a lengthy stay but give him a short period
11
       of time to get his stuff together and then report to the
12
       Marshal's Office, but don't make it immediate. So don't
13
       take him into custody right away.
14
                 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Jacobs, let me hear what
15
       your thoughts are on this.
16
                 MR. JACOBS: Your Honor, briefly, we share the
17
       Court's concern about Mr. Wolfe's challenges with abiding by
18
       supervision. But I think in the interest of allowing
19
       Mr. Wolfe to work on his mental-health challenges and
20
       substance-abuse issues, we have no objection or issue with a
21
       short period of turn-around for self-surrender.
22
                 THE COURT: Okay. I don't want to give him more
23
       than a short period. So what I'll do is have him report
24
       tomorrow, Mr. Olson, which will give him self-surrender.
25
                 MR. OLSON: Should he report to the Marshal's
```

1	Office here in this building?
2	THE COURT: Yes.
3	So, Mr. Wolfe, I'm going to order you to report
4	tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m. to the United States
5	Marshal's Service here in this courthouse. You can talk to
6	Mr. Olson about what that involves.
7	I'm taking a chance on you. If it was not for
8	what I just heard from your counsel, my inclination would be
9	to have the marshals take you right now. But by giving you
10	a chance to self-surrender, it's going to help you a lot as
11	you serve in prison. You're going to get more programming.
12	You're going to get a better facility. So I'm taking a
13	chance on you. I need you to give me your word you're going
14	to show up tomorrow morning at 10:00. Will you do that?
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Okay. So you should report to the
17	United States Marshal here at 10:00 tomorrow morning, then.
18	Okay?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Olson, anything else?
21	MR. OLSON: My objection on the restitution
22	order
23	THE COURT: Is noted and preserved.
24	MR. OLSON: is noted and preserved.
25	THE COURT: Yes. That is noted, and your

```
1
       objection is preserved.
2
                 Anything else, Mr. Jacobs?
 3
                 MR. JACOBS: No, Your Honor.
 4
                 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
 5
                 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise.
 6
                 (Court adjourned at 10:16 a.m.)
7
 8
                I, Debra Beauvais, certify that the foregoing is a
 9
       correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the
10
       above-entitled matter.
11
                      Certified by: s/Debra Beauvais
                                     Debra Beauvais, RPR-CRR
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```